

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-8, 10-13, and 15-23 are all the claims pending in the application, claims 2, 9, 14, and 24-27 having been canceled. In summary, the Examiner has added a new reference to the previously applied reference to support the claim rejections. Specifically, claims 1-27 are now rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Sideman (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0116716) in view of new reference Fushiki (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0044732).

With respect to independent claim 1 (which now incorporates the features of previously pending claim 2), Applicants previously submitted that Sideman does not disclose or suggest at least, “wherein the client is operable to download the multimedia editing program from the server,” as recited in amended claim 1. *See page 9 of March 11 Amendment and Response dated June 27, 2008.* In the present Office Action, the Examiner maintains the exact same arguments as previously presented. That is, the Examiner alleges that Sideman satisfies the features of claim 2, which are now incorporated into claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants maintain the previously submitted arguments as the Examiner does not change his rationale for rejecting claim 2. That is, Applicants submit that Sideman only discloses that a client is allowed to control a video editor program running on a server. There is no teaching of such applications being downloaded to a client. A client in Sideman may receive an interface to communicate with an editing program that resides on a server, but the client in Sideman does not download a multimedia editing program from the server. At least based on the foregoing, Applicants submit that amended claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over the applied references, including Sideman.

Applicants maintain that amended independent claims 5, 12, 13, and 19 are patentable at least based on reasons similar to those set forth above with respect to independent claim 1.

Applicants submit that dependent claims 3, 4, 6-8, 10, 11, 15-18, and 20-23 are patentable at least by virtue of their respective dependencies from independent claims 1, 5, 13, and 19.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,


SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: January 26, 2009


Diallo T. Crenshaw
Registration No. 52,778